**CLERK** 

11/26/2018 9:56 am

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK U.S. DISTRICT COURT

**EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK** 

**LONG ISLAND OFFICE** -----X **Docket#** 

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

: 18-CR-00607-JFB

- versus -

: U.S. Courthouse

: Central Islip, New York

KHWAJA, et al.,

Defendant

: November 15, 2018

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR ARRAIGNMENT BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOSEPH F. BIANCO UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

P Р E R Α N C E S: Α

For the Government:

Richard P. Donoghue, Esq.

United States Aftorney

BY:

Burton T. Ryan, Jr., Esq. Assistant U.S. Attorney 100 Federal Plaza Central Islip, NY 11722

For Defendant E. Khwaja:

Anthony LaPinta, Esq.
Reynolds, Caronia,
Giannelli, Hagney,
LaPinta & Hargraves
200 Vanderbilt Motor Pkwy
Hauppauge, NY 11788

For Defendant A. Khwaja:

Nancy L. Bartling, Esq. LaRusso & Conway, LLP 300 Old Country Rd, Ste 341 Mineola, NY 11501

For Defendant Rahimi:

Alan M. Nelson, Esq. 300 Marcus Avenue Lake Success, NY 11042

For Defendant Rhamatzada:

Glenn Obedin, Esq. Naiburg, Obedin & Weissman, LLP 320 Carleton Avenue Central Islip, NY 11722

Transcription Service:

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc. 61 Beatrice Avenue West Islip, New York 11795 laferrara44@gmail.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound-recording, transcript produced by transcription service

```
2
                            Proceedings
 1
              THE CLERK: Calling Case 18-cr-607, United
 2
   States of America v. Khwaja.
 3
              Counsel, please state your appearance for the
 4
   record.
 5
              MR. RYAN: For the government, your Honor,
 6
   Burton Ryan.
 7
              MR. LAPINTA: Appearing for Enayatullah Khwaja,
 8
   Anthony LaPinta.
 9
              Good morning, your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. LaPinta.
11
              MS. BARTLING: Good afternoon, your Honor.
12
              Appearing for Abdulrahman Khwaja, Nancy
13
   Bartling.
14
              MR. OBEDIN: Good afternoon, your Honor.
15
              Appearing for Shikeba Rhamatzada, Glenn Obedin.
16
              THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Obedin.
17
              MR. NELSON: Good afternoon, your Honor.
18
              Appearing on behalf of Rana Rahimi, Alan
19
   Nelson.
20
              THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Nelson.
21
              We have all four defendants present in the
22
   courtroom. As you know, this case was assigned me
23
   pursuant to the indictment that was returned by the grand
24
   jury. I assume all four defendants were arrested earlier
25
   today. Mr. Ryan, is that correct?
```

```
3
                            Proceedings
              MR. RYAN: That's correct, Judge.
 1
 2
              THE COURT: Okay. Let me just advise them of
 3
   their rights.
              I'm going to advise you of your rights, each of
 4
 5
   the four defendants. You have the right to have the
 6
   charges that have been filed against you presented to you
 7
   and get a copy of it. That would be the indictment.
 8
              You have the right to retain counsel or if you
 9
   cannot afford counsel, one would be appointed to
10
   represent you in the case. You also have the right to
11
   have the circumstances, if any, under which you should be
12
   released on bail be considered by the Court and you have
13
    a right not to make a statement and any statement you
14
   make can be used against you.
15
              Do you understand that -- I'm just going to use
16
    the first initial -- Mr. E. Khwaja?
17
              DEFENDANT E. KHWAJA: Yes.
18
              THE COURT: Mr. A. Khwaja?
19
              DEFENDANT A. KHWAJA:
20
              THE COURT: Ms. Rhamatzada?
21
              DEFENDANT S. RHAMATZADA: Yes.
22
              THE COURT: And Ms. Rahimi? You just have to
23
    speak into the mic.
24
              DEFENDANT R. RAHIMI: Yes.
25
              THE COURT: Okay. So first I am going to deal
```

4 Proceedings with the issue of counsel. I have -- I think I have only 1 2 two financial affidavits before me but it appears I have 3 the one for A. Khwaja, as well as Rhamatzada, Ms. Rhamatzada, but it appears they have significant assets 4 5 based upon the affidavit. 6 So let me just ask you, Mr. Obedin, is it her 7 intention to retain counsel? Is that -- what do you 8 understand to be her intention? 9 MR. OBEDIN: Well, your Honor, it's my 10 understanding that the family has retained counsel. 11 THE COURT: Oh, okay. 12 MR. OBEDIN: I spoke earlier this evening or 13 this afternoon with Noam Biale from Sher Tremonte who 14 informed me that he is retained --15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. OBEDIN: -- to represent my client but he 17 would like me to go forward with the arraignment and to 18 make a bail application. 19 THE COURT: Okay. MR. OBEDIN: And so I am prepared to do that. 20 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 MR. OBEDIN: However, I did not discuss the 23 waiver of time with him and I would be more comfortable 24 not waiving time and allowing him to make that decision 25 when he ultimately steps in which he told me could be as

5 Proceedings early as tomorrow if the Court wanted to put the case 1 2 back on for tomorrow. 3 THE COURT: Yes, I certainly -- especially if you're not comfortable waiving time, to put it on for 4 5 tomorrow. 6 MR. OBEDIN: I think that would best. 7 THE COURT: Okay. But let me just ask your 8 client, are you -- Ms. Rhamatzada, as you heard, your 9 retained counsel is not available today. So I just want 10 to make sure you're okay with Mr. Obedin representing you 11 for today's proceeding. 12 DEFENDANT S. RHAMATZADA: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Okay. So I am going to appoint 14 you, Mr. Obedin, just for today, okay? 15 And Ms. Bartling, what's your understanding? 16 MS. BARTLING: Your Honor, I have not spoken to 17 any other attorney and my client indicated to me he would 18 like me to proceed as his counsel. He is authorized me 19 and agreed to have me proceed and with respect to that, I 20 will continue if the Court allows. I haven't not spoken 21 to anyone else, so at this point, it's not my belief that 22 he will be hiring additional counsel. 23 THE COURT: Yes. I mean, I will allow you to 24 certainly to represent him for purposes of today but, for 25 example, it says he has a \$900,000 home. So I don't know

```
6
                            Proceedings
 1
   what the equity is in the home but he would have to give
 2
   me more information for me to appoint you for beyond
 3
   today, okay?
              MS. BARTLING: Understood.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: All right.
 6
              Mr. LaPinta, what's your understanding?
 7
              MR. LAPINTA: Your Honor, my client has advised
 8
   me of his desire to have me continue with his
   representation. I'm not aware of whether he has filled
 9
   out a financial affidavit or not. I haven't spoken to
10
11
   him regarding his finances or ability to retain counsel.
12
   There's been no private lawyer that's been engaged or in
13
    contact at this juncture and I am prepared to move
14
   forward until otherwise directed by the Court.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. Yes, again, similar to the
16
   other counsel, I will appoint you for purposes of today's
17
   proceeding. I would ask that you work with your client
18
   to fill out the affidavit to see whether he would qualify
19
    to have you be appointed or not, okay?
20
              MR. LAPINTA: Yes.
21
              THE COURT: All right.
22
              And Mr. Nelson, what's your understanding?
23
              MR. NELSON: Judge, I am in the position as Mr.
24
   LaPinta is. I have spoken to my client, as well as her
25
   husband. They would like me to proceed and represent
```

7 Proceedings 1 them for purposes of today. I spoke with pretrial 2 services, and they were going to have an affidavit 3 prepared. I believe that a representative of pretrial services just left to get the fee affidavit they have 4 5 prepared and I am prepared to proceed today with the 6 Court's permission on behalf --7 THE COURT: But you believe that they will 8 qualify based upon your conversations or you don't know? 9 MR. NELSON: I'm not sure, Judge. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. NELSON: I'm acquiring information 12 concerning the equity in their home for purposes of 13 potential bail application at a later time. I think 14 that's going to be the Court's decision. 15 THE COURT: All right. Okay. So I will also 16 appoint you, at least for purposes of today, until we 17 figure out the financial circumstances to represent Ms. 18 Rahimi. 19 In terms of what I thought we would do, I know 20 we we're waiting for some pretrial services report, for 21 any counsel who wished to make a bail application today, 22 obviously I will wait for the report and my understanding 23 from talking to my deputy is that would be at least -- is 24 it Mr. Nelson --25 THE CLERK: Yes, Judge.

```
8
                            Proceedings
 1
              THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Nelson, you don't plan on
 2
   making a bail application today, is that correct?
 3
              MR. NELSON: That's correct, your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right. So we will proceed with
 4
 5
   everything except the bail issues and Mr. Nelson, you
 6
   could even -- once we get through with you, you can
 7
   leave. You don't have to hang around for the bail
 8
   arguments if you don't want to. You're free to stay
 9
   obviously, if you wish. Okay?
10
              MR. NELSON: Thank you, your Honor.
11
              THE COURT: All right. So are each of the
12
    clients prepared to be arraigned on the indictment?
13
              MR. LAPINTA: Yes, your Honor.
14
              MR. OBEDIN: Yes, your Honor.
15
              MS. BARTLING: Yes.
16
              MR. NELSON: Yes.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. -- how do you pronounce
18
   the first name?
19
              DEFENDANT E. KHWAJA: [N-EYE-TOE-LA].
20
              THE COURT: -- Enayatullah Khwaja, have you
21
   received a copy of the indictment?
22
              DEFENDANT E. KHWAJA: Yes.
23
              THE COURT: Have you had time to review it and
24
    discuss it with Mr. LaPinta for purposes of being
25
   arraigned?
```

```
9
                            Proceedings
1
              DEFENDANT E. KHWAJA: Yes.
 2
              THE COURT: Do you waive the public reading of
   the entire indictment?
 3
              DEFENDANT E. KHWAJA: Yes.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: And how do you plead, guilty or not
 6
   quilty?
 7
              DEFENDANT E. KHWAJA: Not guilty.
 8
              THE COURT: All right. A not guilty plea has
 9
   been entered.
10
              Mr. Abdulrahman Khwaja, have you received a
11
   copy of the indictment?
12
              DEFENDANT A. KHWAJA: Yes, sir.
13
              THE COURT: Have you had time to discuss it and
14
   review it with Ms. Bartling for purposes of your
15
   arraignment?
16
              DEFENDANT A. KHWAJA: Yes.
17
              THE COURT: Do you waive the public reading of
18
   the indictment?
19
              DEFENDANT A. KHWAJA: Yes.
20
              THE COURT: How do you plead, guilty or not
21
   guilty?
22
              DEFENDANT A. KHWAJA: Not quilty.
23
              THE COURT: Okay. A not guilty plea has been
24
   entered.
25
              Ms. Rhamatzada, have you received a copy of the
```

```
10
                            Proceedings
 1
   indictment?
 2
              DEFENDANT S. RHAMATZADA: Yes.
 3
              THE COURT: Have you had time to discuss it --
   review and discuss it with Mr. Obedin for purposes of the
 4
 5
   arraignment?
 6
              DEFENDANT S. RHAMATZADA: Yes.
 7
              THE COURT: Do you waive the public reading of
   the indictment?
 8
 9
              DEFENDANT S. RHAMATZADA: Yes.
10
              THE COURT: How do you plead?
11
              DEFENDANT S. RHAMATZADA: Not quilty.
12
              THE COURT: Okay, a not guilty plea has been
13
   entered.
14
              And Ms. Rahimi, have you received a copy of the
15
   indictment?
16
              DEFENDANT R. RAHIMI: Yes.
17
              THE COURT: Have you had time to discuss it
18
   with Mr. Nelson and review it?
19
              DEFENDANT R. RAHIMI: Yes.
20
              THE COURT: Do you waive the public reading of
21
   the indictment?
22
              DEFENDANT R. RAHIMI: Yes.
23
              THE COURT: How do you plead, guilty or not
24
   guilty?
25
              DEFENDANT R. RAHIMI: Not quilty.
```

Proceedings

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Rahimi has entered a not guilty plea. Okay.

So why don't I hear from the government, not on the issue of bail yet but in terms of just generally moving forward.

MR. RYAN: Judge, two things; one, we believe the case which involves months of electronic surveillance of these defendants is a complex case. Not only is there electronic surveillance, there's also a tremendous number of bank records. There's at least 21 different bank accounts that were seized today and the bank records go back many years, as well as the execution of search warrants that is ongoing as we speak of the businesses and their bank records.

So we believe that the case should be declared a complex case for Speedy Trial purposes. Also, we have submitted to -- under separate cover to your Honor today, an application for an order to unseal certain of the defendants' electronic interception, so that we can serve them and their attorneys with copies of the electronic interceptions.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. RYAN: And so we intend to proceed immediately to discovery, as soon as those issues are addressed.

12 Proceedings 1 THE COURT: Okay. Have you discussed with 2 defense counsel a date for the next status conference or 3 you didn't get that far? MR. RYAN: I believe, Judge, that there was a 4 5 discussion originally of 30 days but when everyone 6 realized that new counsel would be coming in, I believe 7 that there was a date about 14 days out as a control date 8 that was selected while the issue of representation is resolved. 9 10 THE COURT: All right. Is that November 30th 11 then? Is that what the date -- Michelle? 12 THE CLERK: Yes, November 30th. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 THE CLERK: It's the date, at 1 o'clock. 15 THE COURT: All right. In terms of the complex 16 case designation, I think I will hold off on that 17 designation until again, we figure out who the counsel is 18 going to be, make sure that they don't disagree with 19 that. I will, obviously, deal with the Speedy Trial 20 issue independent of that designation. 21 But let me start with Mr. Nelson, since you're 22 not making a bail application today, so what do you want 23 to do in terms of the next date, Mr. Nelson? Did you 24 MR. NELSON: Your Honor, I have discussed this 25 with my -- I have discussed the issue with my client and

```
13
                            Proceedings
 1
   we are prepared to exclude Speedy Trial till November the
 2
   30th at 1 o'clock, which I understand is a convenient
 3
   time for the Court.
              THE COURT: Okay. Have you executed the
 4
 5
   waiver?
 6
              MR. NELSON: Yes, I have.
 7
              THE COURT: Okay. Do you have it?
 8
              THE CLERK: They must still have it.
 9
   defendant still have the waiver over there?
              THE COURT: Just give me one second.
10
11
    (Pause)
12
              THE COURT: I now have all four pretrial
13
    services reports. I am just reviewing them.
14
    (Pause)
15
              THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Rahimi, I just want to
16
   make sure you understand what this form means. I am sure
17
   Mr. Nelson has explained it to you. You heard -- he's
18
   asking me to adjourn your case until November 30th.
19
   have a right to have a trial within 70 days of today
20
   under the Speedy Trial Act.
21
              However, you also have the right to ask that
22
   that clock be stopped because you want to have time to
23
   consider how you want to proceed with respect to the
24
   case. I am trying to read the handwriting here in terms
25
   of the reason.
```

14 Proceedings 1 MR. NELSON: Your Honor, it would be to review 2 the discovery that's provided by the government. 3 THE COURT: Okay. I don't know what that says. MR. NELSON: You wouldn't be the first person 4 5 to have difficulty reading my handwriting, your Honor. THE COURT: Oh, does that say review of 6 7 discovery, is that what you wrote? 8 MR. NELSON: Yes. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Yeah, I could see that now. 10 Okay. I will leave it. So that will give -- the 11 government is going to give discovery or evidence in the 12 case to you and your attorney to start reviewing it, and 13 how you want to proceed with respect to the case. 14 Also, as I will discuss in a moment, your 15 lawyer is consenting to your detention without prejudice 16 to making a bail application. So even before November 17 30th, he can ask to come in and make a bail application 18 at you request. 19 But I want to make sure you understand by 20 signing this, you're agreeing to stop that clock until 21 November 30th, so that you and your lawyer can do those 22 things. Is that your wish? 23 DEFENDANT R. RAHIMI: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Okay. So I am going to -- and 25 obviously, we'll deal with this issue with the other

15 Proceedings 1 three defendants if they don't agree to that next date 2 but I am going to put this defendant on for November 30th 3 There's only one Speedy Trial clock for the case and again, I will deal with this issue in a moment 4 5 with the other defense counsel but for purposes of this 6 defendant, at least for now, I am excluding the time from 7 today until November 30th, under Title 18 USC Section 3161(h)(7)(A), in order to allow her and her counsel time 8 9 to obtain the discovery and review it and decide how they 10 wish to proceed with respect to the case. 11 I find that the ends of justice served by 12 granting the continuance outweigh the best interest of 13 both the public and the defendant in a speedier trial. 14 Actually, I am looking at the waiver now. I 15 see that other defendants have signed it as well. I am 16 just trying to -- Mr. Abdulrahman signed it, is that 17 correct, Ms. Bartling? 18 MS. BARTLING: That's correct. 19 THE COURT: Okay. And who is the defendant 20 number one's signature, I can't read --21 MR. LAPINTA: I did, your Honor, yes. 22 THE COURT: Okay. So your client is willing to 23 agree to that, as well? 24 MR. LAPINTA: To the Speedy Trial waiver, yes. 25 THE COURT: Okay. So let me just --

```
16
                            Proceedings
 1
   Enayatullah Khwaja and Abdulrahman Khwaja, you heard what
 2
   I just explained. It's the same thing for you, by
 3
   signing this waiver, you're agreeing to exclude the time
   under the Speedy Trial Act until November 30th, so you
 4
 5
    and your attorneys can obtain discovery and review it.
 6
              Is that your wish, Mr. Enayatullah Khwaja?
 7
              DEFENDANT E. KHWAJA: Yes.
              THE COURT: And Mr. Abdulrahman Khwaja?
 8
              DEFENDANT A. KHWAJA: Yes.
 9
10
              THE COURT: Okay. So again, I am making the
11
   same finding as with respect to them. And let me just
   ask you, Mr. Obedin, what's your intention with respect
12
13
   to this issue?
14
              MR. OBEDIN: Yes, your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: I guess we're going to put this on
16
    for tomorrow --
17
              MR. OBEDIN: Since I am only here for the
18
   purpose of arraignment --
19
              THE COURT: Right. Okay.
20
              MR. OBEDIN: -- I really think it's in the best
21
    interest of my client to speak with her retained attorney
22
    tomorrow --
23
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
24
              MR. OBEDIN: -- and make that determination.
25
              THE COURT: So what I am going to do is I am
```

17 Proceedings 1 excluding the time -- as I said, there's only one clock 2 for the case as a whole, I am excluding it to the 30th, 3 subject obviously to new counsel coming in for Ms. Rhamatzada and if there is an objection to that, I will 4 5 deal with it but for present purposes, I am excluding the 6 time from today for the entire case, all four defendants 7 who are present, until November 30th. Under 3161(h)(7)(A), as respect to all of them, 8 I find that the ends of justice served by granting the 9 10 continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and 11 the defendants in a speedier trial, in order to resolve these counsel issues, obtain the discovery and start 12 13 reviewing it. All right, so, I have signed the waiver 14 for the three defendants who signed it. 15 Okay. I have the government's detention letter 16 and you're seeking detention with respect to all four 17 defendants, both on risk of flight and danger to the 18 community, Mr. Ryan? 19 MR. RYAN: Judge, I believe that there is a danger to the community and risk of flight for all four 20 21 defendants, though I believe the primary danger is by the 22 organizers of the -- and the operators of the scheme, the 23 two cousins, Khwaja. I believe that --

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on. I just want to deal with Mr. Nelson first.

24

25

```
18
                            Proceedings
              MR. RYAN: Oh, Mr. Nelson's --
 1
 2
              THE COURT: I just wanted to confirm, you're
 3
   seeking detention for all four?
              MR. RYAN: I seek the detention of all four,
 4
 5
    Judge.
 6
              THE COURT: On both grounds?
 7
              MR. RYAN: On both grounds.
 8
              THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Nelson, I just want
 9
   to confirm as you said earlier, you're consenting to
10
   detention without prejudice to reopening the bail hearing
11
   at any time?
12
              MR. NELSON: That's correct, your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: Okay.
14
              MR. NELSON: I do anticipate having a bail
15
   package to present to the Court by November the 30th, if
16
   not earlier but at the present time, we'll consent to the
17
   entry of a permanent order of detention without
18
   prejudice.
19
              THE COURT: Okay. Based upon the indictment
20
   and the government's letter, as well as the other
21
   information I have in the pretrial services report, at
22
   this juncture, on consent, I am detaining Ms. Rahimi as a
23
   danger and on risk of flight without prejudice to a
24
    future bail application on November 30th or sooner and
25
    then obviously, it will be a de novo review. Okay?
```

19 Proceedings right. 1 2 So now then do you want to address then the 3 issue of detention with regard to the other three defendants? 4 5 MR. RYAN: Yes, Judge. I believe pretrial 6 services has submitted the reports for the other three 7 defendants. 8 THE COURT: Yes, I have them but if you want to 9 say anything else orally beyond your letter --10 MR. RYAN: Judge, I believe it's unnecessary to 11 say anything beyond the letter at this point. If there's 12 any specific issues raised by defense counsel in 13 argument, I will just address them in response. 14 THE COURT: Whoever wants to go first -- Mr. 15 LaPinta, do you want to go first? 16 MR. LAPINTA: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor, 17 before I begin, please note that in court, the support of 18 my client is his wife of 18 years, his two sisters and 19 his brother-in-law. 20 As you note from the pretrial report, my client 21 is 44 years of age. He's a citizen of the United States, 22 having been naturalized in 1996. His parents are residents of Long Island, as are his two sisters, as well 23 24 and his brother. 25 The family has been residing in Nassau County

Proceedings

'80s when my client was a young boy. He's been here now since the age, I believe of 10.

He's gainfully employed. He's the sole financial supporter of his family. He has three children, ages 19, 18 and 13. Most notably, his youngest child, his daughter, has autism and autism spectrum, apraxia is the name of the condition that she suffers from and she requires constant attention and support, both emotionally and physically.

Most of his family, as I said, resides in this area. He does have a prior conviction, although I would say misdemeanor, damage of property conviction where he successfully completed three years of probation in Nassau County. He has no history at all of alcohol abuse or drug abuse or mental health treatment.

While his wife does work, it's a part-time position in Bloomingdale's in the Huntington Mall.

We are prepared with the benefit of having his family owning property, the indictment does list the forfeiture of all of the -- my client's properties, his residence, his investment properties, all of his bank accounts.

However, his family members not related to this indictment are prepared to post their properties and we

are prepared after my doing investigation and speaking with his family members, we are prepared to post \$2.5 million in a secured bond, secured by my client's parent's property located in Glen Head, Nassau County.

There are other properties that we are prepared to post as well, up to an amount of \$4.5\$ million.

In addition to that secured bond, we are willing to surrender the passport that I believe that was seized today by the authorities when they executed the search warrant. We are, of course, willing to limit our travel restrictions to the Metropolitan area, Eastern District, Southern District and report to pretrial services at the Court's discretion.

I understand pretrial is recommending that no bail conditions can satisfy their concern of a risk of flight. If the Court is impressed with that, I would ask that you consider a home confinement situation that would enable him to at least be with his family and provide support, both financially and emotionally during this difficult time.

What I will say in reference to the government's submission, is that no matter how you dice this case, it's a nonviolent crime, it's a financial crime, it seems as though from my reading of it, they're trying to bootstrap narcotics distribution and kind of

Proceedings

making a quasi-presumption case but my argument is is that if it was so closely related to the sale and distribution of narcotics overseas, there would be a charge of conspiracy to distribute narcotics that would be part of this indictment and it is clearly not.

was going to say simple financial crimes, simple but yet complicated financial crimes that are nonviolent in nature that are deserving of a bail package and in light of my client's contacts with the community, and his willingness to obey by numerous imposed conditions that the Court has satisfied, I believe we've presented an overwhelming package that would assure the Court of his presence in court.

THE COURT: Well, let me just ask you a couple of questions before I hear from Mr. Ryan, if he wants to respond. The government's letter talked about him being — having permanent residency status, as well in Saudi Arabia. I don't see that in the pretrial services report. So I don't — is he disputing that or — MR. LAPINTA: Is that to me or the government? I'm sorry.

THE COURT: No, I am asking you whether -
MR. LAPINTA: He does have a residence visa for
that country, yes.

23 Proceedings 1 THE COURT: And they also represent obviously 2 that the import-export business operates out of Saudi 3 Arabia, is that accurate or not accurate? MR. LAPINTA: Well, he does business in Saudi 4 5 -- has done business in Saudi Arabia but in speaking to 6 my client, he is able to function and operate his 7 business from his home without traveling. 8 THE COURT: I'm not focused on whether -- I 9 understand he spends, even though he does foreign travel, 10 that he spends his time in the United States but if the 11 company operates out of Saudi Arabia, that's obviously 12 significant. so I don't know whether he disputes that or 13 not. 14 MR. LAPINTA: Let me just clarify. 15 (Counsel and client confer) 16 THE COURT: I think I read that in the 17 government's letter, is that --18 MR. RYAN: Yes, Judge. The evidence that we 19 have is that they operate a business in Saudi Arabia. 20 THE COURT: What's the name of the business? 21 MR. RYAN: It's -- they're in imports and 22 exports, it involves toys, it involves distribution of 23 electronics and I is a company that he has gone to Saudi 24 Arabia a number of times to supervise and operate. 25 MR. LAPINTA: I speaking to my client, your

Proceedings

Honor, he is willing, as a condition of bail, to forgo any of his interest in that property or involvement in that aspect of his businesses, understanding your concern of his ties to that country and the allegations contained in the indictment and however way we could do that and assure the Court that he is not operating a business out of that country, we'll do that.

only other -- you made a point about that this is not a narcotics case but in terms of the type of proof that the government has, that he is operating a money laundering business that's funneling narcotics proceeds, one of the things that they rely upon is in their letter and I know you don't have the discovery yet but it seems to be very direct where they say an undercover posing as a drug dealer met in a hotel parking lot and that the defendant received bulk currency from the undercover, purporting to be illegal drug sales. Is that accurate, Mr. Ryan?

MR. RYAN: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: So that's not like an indirect theory.

MR. LAPINTA: Well, what is confusing to me is that as I see it and as I read it, that seems to be part of the conspiracy of drug dealing.

THE COURT: Yeah.

25 Proceedings 1 MR. LAPINTA: Why isn't he charged with that? 2 THE COURT: I don't know the answer to that 3 but --MR. LAPINTA: If it was a noteworthy act that 4 5 in furtherance of narcotics distribution, in my 6 experience with the United States Attorney's Office, they 7 would charge that and then you would be presented with a 8 presumption case regarding bail and you're not. 9 THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from Mr. 10 Mr. Ryan, you can respond to anything Mr. LaPinta 11 has said. 12 MR. RYAN: Judge, as the defendant has been 13 involved in multiple instances of receiving bulk cash and 14 using it to funnel monies to Paraguay and other places 15 where the source of the drug dealers are generally 16 operating out of in the tri-border area between 17 Argentina, Brazil and Paraguay, an undercover Homeland 18 Securities agent did provide cash that it was represented 19 to the defendant to be the proceeds of drug dealing that 20 was then transported in the cash delivered to an 21 individual purporting to be a drug dealer in Paraguay. 22 There are -- in the conspiracy, there are at 23 least 13 undercover operations in which Homeland Security 24 or the DEA were instructed by drug dealers when the DEA 25 undercovers were acting as money launderers to transmit

Proceedings

the money they received to the Khwaja companies and that's the nature of the way they operate. It's a trade-based operation in which they use cheap phones as a method of transporting value from the United States to South America.

They also directed transport currency at times to South America or to their brokers in the tri-border area. There's extensive evidence of this, not only from a number of months of wiretaps but also the defendant's phones were examined by Customs agents at various times at border crossing. WhatsApp applications were found on the defendants' phone transmitting money and arranging for the delivery of cash and many of these individuals have been identified directly as involved in the drug trade, or in other criminal organizations both in South America and here in the United States.

THE COURT: All right. Based upon my review of the indictment, and the government's letter, as well as my review of the pretrial services report, the Court is — and obviously I have heard the arguments today, I am detaining Enayatullah Khwaja. I found the government has met its burden both on the issue of risk of flight, by a preponderance of the evidence and at least based upon the indictment and the proffer of the government on the issue of danger — by clear and convincing evidence with

respect to danger to the community, that detention is warranted on both grounds.

The reasons are as follows, just addressing the bail factors and I have considered all of them, I'm going to focus on what I think is the most significant here. Although the defendant has ties to the United States, significant ties as Mr. LaPinta outlined, he also has significant ties overseas. He has some type of residency status in Saudi Arabia. He has a business that operates in Saudi Arabia and certainly would have a place to go if he wished to flee, could go to Saudi Arabia or another country for that matter.

With respect to incentives to flee here, I think they are overwhelming. The government has outlined in the indictment and in their detention letter, a vast massive money laundering operation, operating largely with money being funneled outside the United States to South America over a five-year period through an import-export business. They proffer in their letter, which the Court can accept in its discretion for purposes of the bail hearing today, that this defendant structured over \$3 million in bank accounts, over \$32 million pass through third-party transactions and it is clear that he -- there's millions and millions and millions of dollars that has flowed through bank accounts and companies based

28

upon the nature of the scheme that's alleged, as supplemented by the government's proffer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

so it appears based upon at least the charges and the proffer that he has access to large quantities of cash, millions of dollars in cash through these various sources and therefore, I don't believe there's any conditions or combination of conditions that can reasonably assure his appearance in court because although this is obviously a significant bail package that Mr. LaPinta has set forth here, \$4.5 million, for someone who is involved in an alleged money laundering scheme, involving amounts far surpassing that, that may simply be the price of his freedom in order for him to flee the country and he may have much more money that is available to him in order to live, even losing \$4.5 million and could obviously seek to make whole anyone who lost money as a result of posting something. I don't know what all of their assets are, in any event, but even assuming that this would be a substantial impact on their financial well-being, based upon their own assets, the money that he has available to him for himself and his family in my view is overwhelming.

That's combined with what appears to be -- at least again, this is based on the government proffer and Mr. LaPinta I know doesn't have access to what the

Proceedings

government is relying on but I am always willing to reopen it, if Mr. LaPinta comes back to me and tells me what the government has proffered about the strength of the case is inaccurate but they're relying on electronic surveillance, Custom border searches, undercover dealings, which they proffer has the defendant directly involved with being the manager of this large money laundering operation and it includes recorded conversations with undercovers, so it appears to be a very strong case based upon the government's proffer of its evidence.

The defendant although obviously there's no mandatory minimums or anything like that in this case, given the amounts that are alleged for purposes of the money laundering statute and guidelines, the government is estimating, he is looking at an advisory range of life, although it would be limited by the statutory maximum, which is for all the counts together, 65 years which is a -- essentially would be a life sentence.

So he's facing significant penalties in what appears to be a strong case, has access to enormous amounts of monies, including overseas, so I don't believe there are any conditions or combination of conditions that could reasonably assure this Court that he will show up if I were to release him on bail.

Proceedings

On the issue of home detention, I don't view that as a deterrent for somebody who really wants to flee and has the money and the access to -- ability to flee because nobody could -- if he was on a bracelet, he could cut the bracelet and have a head start and it would be very hard to find someone if they got a head start. So I don't really think home detention can assure the Court that he wouldn't flee.

I also believe, and the issue of danger obviously is his -- there are no drug charges. There's no alleged violence of any type. However, given the nature of these charges, which involve not just money laundering for any type of illegal activity -- you know, the specified activity here is that it's drug proceeds and I believe that the laundering of drug proceeds provides the mechanism for drugs to be distributed and that someone who is involved in large-scale money laundering as it relates to drug proceeds does pose a danger to the community.

And again, on bail, even from home detention, it would be difficult, if not impossible to really monitor whether someone was continuing to be involved in that type of activity when you have such a large-scale network involving so many bank accounts, inside and outside of the United States, there would be no way to be

31 Proceedings 1 able to reasonably assure that someone didn't continue 2 their involvement in money laundering, especially as I 3 said, you have an operation as to -- alleged to be of this complexity and magnitude. So I am detaining him as 4 5 well, by clear and convincing evidence for that reason. 6 And as I said, Mr. LaPinta, this is without 7 prejudice to you or another lawyer coming back and if 8 there's something about that I relied on in my analysis based upon what's been proffered to me, that over time 9 10 appears to not be accurate, I am always willing to look 11 at it again, all right? 12 Although I would say on this issue of 13 representation, I'm looking at the pretrial services 14 report, his assets are -- his net worth is \$1.9 million. 15 So that's obviously not going to qualify, so maybe -- I 16 know this was done quickly and maybe there is more to the 17 liabilities part of it but --18 MR. LAPINTA: Well, most if not all of that is 19 subject to forfeiture --20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. LAPINTA: -- contained in the claim --22 THE COURT: All right. 23 MR. LAPINTA: -- the indictment. 24 THE COURT: Well, again, you can have 25 discussion with him about that and you could submit a

32 Proceedings 1 letter to me on it with an affidavit. We'll deal with 2 that in that way, okay? 3 MR. LAPINTA: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Ms. Bartling, you can 4 5 go ahead. 6 MS. BARTLING: Thank you. Your Honor, with 7 respect to my client, Abdulrahman Khwaja, he's 62-years-8 old, as the pretrial report indicates. He is a citizen of the United States. He does not have dual citizenship 9 in any other country. He's lived in New York for 35 10 11 years and he's actually lived at his Syosset address 12 where he owns that home since 1994. 13 He has four children. They are all here in 14 support of him and they were all born in this country, as 15 well. He is the sole supporter of his family. 16 I want to address the detention memo, your 17 Honor, from the government. With respect to the flight 18 risk, as you can see in the indictment, there is quite a 19 large amount of bank accounts and real property that's 20 been subject to forfeiture. 21 That being said, my client doesn't appear and 22 doesn't seem to have access to any financial means in 23 order to flee the country. That said, there could be 24

monitoring or whatever needs to be put in place to ensure

conditions that could be put in place such as ankle

25

his return to court, being that he does not have financial means to flee, he wouldn't be a flight risk.

More importantly, with respect to the risk of - I'm sorry, the danger to the community, as Mr. Ryan
discussed that these allegations here involved drugs and
money laundering, Mr. Ryan indicates, I believe -- I am
not sure if he did on the record, but had indicated at
one point that there was an involvement in over 13
surveillances. That's concerning to me that there were
over 13 surveillances done and if there was that large
number and no drug deals had gone -- happened in that
surveillance, I would think that a drug charge would have
been charged in that amount of surveillances.

That said, as the Court indicated, this is not a presumption case. It's not a drug case at all. It's actually a financial case and conditions can be met to ensure his return.

In addition to that, most importantly, my client's business is separate from Enayatullah Khwaja's business. He does not have a business in Saudi Arabia and the detention memo written by the government seems to group the two of them together as one stronger argument for a risk of flight and danger to community but if you refer to page 3, the main paragraphs relating to the danger to the community, the first, you specifically --

Proceedings

which is what the Court addressed, involved meetings in hotel parking lots, as well as money laundering, of drug involvement.

My client is not a -- appears to be involved or mentioned in that paragraph. In fact, he's mentioned in the following paragraph where they discuss structuring, which as we know, are charges related to financial crimes and not of danger to the community.

In addition, the following sentence which I believe is used to further the government's argument for a danger to the community, indicates that he was stopped and offered a bribe to Customs agents.

My concern with that being an argument that he is a danger, I don't see charges that he was brought -- that he was arrested or charged at any point with bribing of Customs agents which was obviously a crime.

That said, these reasons under danger to the community don't seem to support a permanent detention that no conditions can be met in order to return his -- to ensure his return to court.

In addition, I am able, at this point, to introduce two properties as a package at this point which can total approximately over \$2 million. They are not related to any of the family members. They're not related to any of the companies or anything listed in the

subject of forfeiture here.

It's my understanding one of them is my client's son's wife's father, if the Court followed. In addition to that, the other one is my client's brother who has no connection to -- anything to do with this -- the instant nature -- the nature of the instant offense.

In addition to that, your Honor, I believe that there are conditions that can be met. He can be wearing a bracelet. He could be forced to just contact with -- do business contacts within the United States.

In addition to that, he does not have a company in Saudi Arabia. He does not need to travel. The Court can put some sort of ban and we can surrender passports and we can do all sorts of things in order for him to maintain contact with only this jurisdiction and we're able to do that. He can still support his family and make a living while on home detainment.

And for these reasons, we believe that he is not a flight risk and that he is not a danger to the community.

THE COURT: Let me just -- before I hear from Mr. Ryan, I mean you're trying to distinguish the proof, I guess, from Enayatullah Khwaja's proof but there is in the government's letter, they say on 13 occasions, your client's companies received wires, in which agents acting

as undercovers were directed by the drug dealers to transport money from drug sales to those companies, in order to have them sent to South America. Do you see where I am reading that on page 3?

So there does appear to be proof that his company was being utilized for drug dealers to funnel money into South America, right? Or am I misreading that?

MR. RYAN: That is correct, Judge. In those particular undercover operations of the DEA and the homeland security were based on completely separate investigations, not involving an investigation at that time, into money laundering but into the various different drug operations around the United States.

The one commonality of all of them is that the drug dealers told the undercover DEA agents or homeland security agents to transfer the drug money to this defendant's companies in Florida, at which point the company was identified as being the primary money launderer between the United States and various South American suppliers and cartels that were moving cocaine and heroin into the United States.

THE COURT: I mean, these companies that are listed in paragraph 3 of the indictment, are his companies. These aren't --

37 Proceedings 1 MR. RYAN: Those are his companies that he owns 2 and controls, not Mr. Enayatullah -- not the codefendants. 3 THE COURT: All right. 4 5 MR. RYAN: It's all part of the same conspiracy 6 but this is what the -- it's split up in the letter as to 7 the particular conduct of each set of companies that they 8 control. 9 THE COURT: Okay. I don't know if you want --10 is there anything -- before I make a decision, is there 11 anything else you want to respond to that Ms. Bartling 12 said? 13 MR. RYAN: No, Judge, I would just repeat the 14 arguments of pretrial services and the standards and 15 findings that you found for the co-defendant. 16 THE COURT: All right. I don't know if you 17 want to address that point. 18 MS. BARTLING: No, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Okay. I'm also detaining 20 Abdulrahman Khwaja. I'm not going to repeat all the 21 grounds that I have already stated. Almost everything I 22 said with respect to Enayatullah Khwaja applies to 23 Abdulrahman Khwaja in terms of, you know, his sentence, 24 the exposure he faces, the strength of the case and the 25 nature of the alleged scheme, in terms of the funneling

Proceedings

of vast sums of money overseas, millions and millions of dollars, the government puts in the letter, that with respect to this particular defendant, there was structuring over \$3 million into numerous bank accounts, over \$32 million dollars in third-party transactions passed through his companies returning to South America.

So all of those reasons apply and although again, that's a significant package and one distinction is that he does not have any type of status in a foreign country, as the co-defendant doesn't have a business overseas, I don't think that that impacts the Court's overall analysis that there are no conditions or combination of conditions that can reasonably assure that Abdulrahman Khwaja would appear in court and again, my analysis with respect to home detention, bracelets is the same. I don't think that they will prevent someone who wants to flee and has the ability to flee financially and otherwise, and so I don't believe that that addresses the Court's concerns.

I do also find for the same reasons that he is a danger to the community by clear and convincing evidence based upon the nature of the charges, combined with the government's proffer, that drug dealers on more than one occasion, 13 different occasions, were directing an undercover, posing as a drug dealer, that the money

Proceedings

should be funneled through this defendant's companies.

So I believe for the reasons already indicated, that large-scale funneling of drug proceeds creates a danger to the community because it allows the drug business to flourish. So for those reasons, I am detaining him on both grounds. All right?

And Mr. Obedin?

MR. OBEDIN: Thank you, your Honor. First I would like to point to the pretrial report and their recommendation which is that Ms. Rhamatzada be released on a substantial bond secured by property and co-signed by responsible sureties, of which we have both with a number of conditions, which we agree with and consent to and feel are significant enough to ensure that she will return each and every court date and not be a danger to the community or a risk of flight.

She has lived here in the United States for over 30 years. She is a U.S. citizen, as is her husband, as are her children, as are all her family who all live here on Long Island. She has no ties to any foreign country.

Again, she has four children ages 16, 14, 12 and 8 and I would say, your Honor, that any risk of flight is canceled out by the fact that she would certainly not leave her children behind and it would not

Proceedings

be so easy for an individual to take an entire family and flee, while it might be easy for one person individually to do that.

With regard to the government's letter, when they speak of danger to the community, they specifically do not indicate that she is a danger to the community. They speak specifically of the two gentlemen who have already had their bail applications heard by the Court and I believe that that is correct. Clearly, individually on her own, she is not a danger to the community. She -- even by the allegations, was not an organizer, was not a manager, did not run these businesses, even based on the proffer of the government and the indictment, she worked there, did paperwork for the company.

I have three homes, none of which are part of the forfeiture allegations in the indictment. The first being her own home, where she lives with her husband who is here and her four children. That home has approximately \$800,000 in equity.

Then there is her brother who lives in Farmingdale. He is a doctor at St. Catherine's Medical Center. His wife is also an M.D. here on Long Island. They live in their home with four young children and their home is also worth approximately \$800,000 in

```
41
                            Proceedings
 1
   equity.
 2
              And finally, her husband's brother who lives in
 3
   Kings Park with his wife and their child and that home is
   worth approximately $650,000, so that's approximately
 4
 5
   $2.1 or $2.2 million.
 6
              THE COURT: Wait, who is the last one? What
 7
   relationship?
 8
              MR. OBEDIN: That's her brother-in-law. It's
 9
   her husband's brother --
10
              THE COURT: Okay.
11
              MR. LAPINTA: -- who lives in Kings Park.
12
   of those individuals are -- have anything to do with this
13
    -- the allegations in these indictment and they are
14
   prepared to put up their homes and sign personally on her
   behalf.
15
16
              I think given those circumstances, the fact
17
    that pretrial makes their recommendation and we are in
18
   agreement with all of the conditions, I think that is a
19
    substantial enough package to ensure the safety of the
20
   community, ensure that she will remain here in the
21
   Eastern District of New York and I would ask your Honor
   to grant that package.
22
23
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ryan?
24
              MR. RYAN: Judge, the defendant is president of
25
   two of the companies in which the undercover operations
```

Proceedings

of the agents were involved in transporting the money, the agents in Florida that are owned by Abdulrahman.

She's the president of those companies and involved in that, as an officer.

Also the pretrial services report indicates that she is a -- has an ownership interest in 10 companies that she knows nothing about and could not give values for or even names for, other than one.

It's our belief that these are, based on what we have been able to trace out and the way that Khwaja family distributes monies amongst themselves from the companies, that we have been able to seize or lien the bank accounts of, that this is all subject to potential forfeiture and seizure and we would -- this package would need to be reviewed and detailed by the agents and myself before we could even come to a reasonable determination as to whether it's acceptable or not.

And so we don't believe that a bail package could be set today, given the lack of background and information that has been provided to us at this late date.

THE COURT: Well, let me just -- in terms of, I know you say that -- she is the president of the companies but the indictment alleges that she is basically a bookkeeper, right? You're not alleging that

Proceedings

she is --

MR. RYAN: Yes, but, Judge, the nature of the booking is the -- when the customs audit occurred within the last year in Florida, the way the nature of the books are, they could not identify the source of funds for the various shipments or the -- they were unable to identify who -- the people who were paying for whatever shipments they were making, were not the people who were receiving it. It was all third-party payments and they were not able -- the way the books are kept is they're moved from company to company within the Khwaja enterprise, so that it's impossible to tell who is the ownership or who is the control, or who is the nature of the money that it comes from.

And we do know from other indictments and other arrests we've made, that the true ownership of the money is completely different third parties who have been ordered or directed the money be sent to the Khwajas, to then be shipped as phones to South America where it's sold and delivered to them.

She is the one that maintains the double sets of books and records that help show who the true owner of and the person that they have to get the money to is, which is separate and apart from what they report to Customs and what they report in any of the shipping

Proceedings

labels or any of the other public records that have been available.

So her position puts her in a position to know that they're money laundering, to know that the money is not going to the people that they're shipping the phones to.

THE COURT: What's the nature of your proof against her?

MR. RYAN: The nature of the proof again is both the electronic eavesdropping that we have occurred, as well as the audit that was made by the Customs individuals of the companies that she is president of and that she was involved in in Florida, as well as the fact that third-party deliveries of bulk cash had been made to companies under her control.

THE COURT: What evidence do you have regarding her sharing the proceeds? I know you said she has an ownership interest in the ten companies but what do you know about her sharing in the proceeds?

MR. RYAN: It's our understanding that the -we don't have -- and that's what the search today will
help uncover but we do know how the family distributes
ownership is in sort of a pro rata sharing business,
based on the family -- that's why -- it's a closely-held
family corporation, Judge.

45 Proceedings 1 THE COURT: What search warrants are you doing 2 today? 3 MR. RYAN: Today, we're doing search warrants on all the companies here on Long Island, which is listed 4 5 on -- in the indictment on paragraph 2 and 3, and all the 6 companies in Florida are also being searched as we speak. 7 THE COURT: All right. Do you want to respond 8 to that, Mr. Obedin? Is there anything you want to 9 respond to? I do have concerns about ownership in ten 10 companies and that gives me some pause. 11 MR. OBEDIN: Yes, your Honor. That's something 12 that is mentioned apparently in the pretrial report. 13 It's not mentioned in the government's proffer. It's not 14 mentioned in anything that they're directly stating to 15 the Court in regards to being a danger or a risk of 16 flight. 17 And I don't believe that Mr. Ryan has given you 18 anything than generalizations regarding that now. 19 certainly didn't given any specifics regarding my client. 20 He gave some generalizations that this is how the 21 "family", he uses that I guess, "family" maintains their 22 closely held businesses but my opinion is the same as what your reaction was, that she is really a bookkeeper 23

and if she is listed as president, that's certainly in

24

25

name only.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

46

THE COURT: All right. This is what I am going First of all, I don't think based upon the indictment and the government's proffer in their letter, they don't -- there's really no -- there's insufficient evidence that she is a danger to the community based upon her involvement in a much larger scheme. It appears whatever her title is, that she acts at the direction of other family members, including the co-defendants. So I don't really have a concern that especially when them being detained, that if I were to release her, that somehow she would run, you know, a vast money laundering operation on her own. So I am not going to detain her based upon risk of flight (sic) but I am going to detain her, at least for today, as a -- I'm not going to detain her as a danger to the community but I am going to detain her as a risk of flight because first of all, obviously the exposure that she is facing, even though she is not the head of this alleged operation, is still going to be significant and my biggest concern at this point, is just to get a better understanding of what access, based upon her involvement in these companies, she would have to large sums of money at this point. Based upon the proffer, although it is

certainly not detailed, there is a concern that this bail

47 Proceedings 1 package, although it's significant, may not be adequate 2 to reasonably assure that she will appear in court 3 because of her position with these other companies and ownership interest in these companies and potential 4 5 access to larger sums of cash, so if -- I am going to ask 6 that this counsel, that you put on the record, that he 7 come tomorrow, I am going to ask the government -- I am going to want more detail, Mr. Ryan, tomorrow with 8 respect to Ms. Rahimi (sic) because I think this is 9 10 obviously a much closer question on risk of flight, 11 given --12 MR. OBEDIN: Your Honor, excuse me, it's Ms. 13 Rhamatzada. 14 THE COURT: I mean -- I am sorry, it's late. 15 Ms. Rhamatzada. So, I think the government is going to 16 have to come back with more detail and maybe after

Ms. Rhamatzada. So, I think the government is going to have to come back with more detail and maybe after speaking to Mr. Obedin or her retained counsel, there might be a way of addressing whatever concerns the government has with additional security. This seems to be substantial to me and maybe sufficient, absent some either result of the searches today. I don't know how much information you'll get quickly or more detailed information from the government that she has in bank accounts or elsewhere, access to large amounts of cash. If the government doesn't supply that, my intention would

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
48
                            Proceedings
 1
   be to release her either on this package or something
 2
   close to it with home detention and electronic
 3
   monitoring, okay? Understood?
              MR. RYAN: Absolutely, Judge.
 4
              THE COURT: All right. So we'll put it on for
 5
 6
   tomorrow for that defendant only. Obviously, no one else
 7
   -- I'm not going to have any of the other defendants
 8
   produced tomorrow.
 9
              What time, Michelle?
              THE CLERK: 1 o'clock.
10
11
              THE COURT: 1 o'clock for Ms. Rhamatzada.
12
              MR. OBEDIN: Okay.
13
              THE COURT: So I am entering the temporary
14
   order of detention until tomorrow. All right.
15
              Are there any other issues today from the
16
   government?
17
              MR. RYAN: No, Judge. I believe that
18
   completes --
19
              THE COURT: I'm going to ask you -- you
20
   submitted the order and said it's going to be on an
21
   oral --
22
              MR. RYAN: Except for the unsealing --
23
              THE COURT: Yeah, I want you to put in a
24
   written application rather than just --
25
              MR. RYAN: All right.
```

```
49
                            Proceedings
              THE COURT: Okay?
1
 2
              MR. RYAN: I will submit one tomorrow, Judge.
 3
              THE COURT: All right. Anything else from any
 4
   defense counsel? And again, for the counsel who may want
 5
    to stay in the case, you have to discuss with the
   defendants and their family whether or not they really
 6
 7
   can qualify and I will wait to hear back from you, okay?
 8
              MR. NELSON: Your Honor, I would only note that
 9
   during the course of the detention hearings, I did have
10
    the opportunity to complete a financial affidavit with my
11
    client that I submitted to the Court.
12
              THE COURT: Okay. Let me look at it.
13
    (Pause)
14
              THE COURT: So the home is -- what's the equity
15
    in that home?
16
              MR. NELSON: It appears to be somewhere in the
17
   area of $600,000, your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: And the annual income is $60,000,
19
    is that --
20
              MR. NELSON: It's approximately $60 to $70,000
21
   a year.
22
              THE COURT: Yes, I mean to me that's a large
23
   sum of money we're talking, both in terms of income and
24
    I'm trying to read the top part here, because the $60,000
25
   is other income?
```

```
50
                            Proceedings
 1
              MR. NELSON: That is dividend income she
 2
   receives and then she receives approximately $4 to $5,000
 3
   a month in income.
              THE COURT: Yes, I am not sure she is going to
 4
 5
   be able to -- if you home that has over $500,000 in
   equity and $60,000 a year coming in in other income, I
 6
 7
   don't think that qualifies. All right?
 8
              MR. NELSON: I will appear at the next
 9
   appearance, your Honor, and I guess a definitive decision
10
   will be made.
11
              THE COURT: Yes, you'll continue in the case
12
   until she can find someone but obviously, she should
13
    start looking, okay?
14
              MR. NELSON: Yes.
15
              THE COURT: All right. Anything else?
16
              MR. LAPINTA: Nothing, your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
18
                    (Matter concluded)
19
                         -000-
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

## CERTIFICATE

51

I, LINDA FERRARA, hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the said proceedings is a true and accurate transcript from the electronic sound-recording of the proceedings reduced to typewriting in the above-entitled matter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially interested directly or indirectly in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand this **20th** day of **November**, 2018.

Linda Ferrara

AAERT CET\*\*D 656

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.